

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/781,842	02/12/2001	Thomas J. Blakemore	D-2958	7727
33197	7590 03/14/2003			
STOUT, UXA, BUYAN & MULLINS LLP			EXAMINER	
4 VENTURE, SUITE 300 IRVINE, CA 92618			LOVERING, RICHARD D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1712	
			DATE MAILED: 03/14/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.





Application No.

Applicant(s)

Office Action Summary	7181,842	BLAKEMOKE EI HL.				
	Examiner LOVERING	Group Art Unit				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears						
Period for Response						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE 3 M	ONTH(S) FROM THE				
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by 	esponse within the statutory minimur	m of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.				
Status						
Responsive to communication(s) filed on OCT 9 AND DE This action is FINAL .	218+73,2002 AND JE	HU. 8, 2003				
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C	formal matters, prosecution a .D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.	s to the merits is closed in				
Disposition of Claims						
© Claim(s) 23-49	is/	is/are pending in the application.				
Of the above claim(s)	is/	is/are withdrawn from consideration				
Claim(s) 23-37 AND 46-49	is/i	is/are allowed				
X Claim(s) 3 8 - 44	is/	is/are rejected				
X Claim(s) 45	is/s	is/are objected to				
□ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————						
Application Papers		e subject to restriction or election quirement.				
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Re	eview PTO-948					
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.						
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.						
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	•					
$\hfill\Box$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)						
 □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the preceived. 						
 □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)_ □ received in this national stage application from the Internal 	ional Bureau (PCT Bule 1.7.2/					
*Certified copies not received:	•	••				
Attachment(s)		•				
, ,	7					
Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). Notice of References Cited, PTO-892						
·		□ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948	☐ Other					
Office Action Summary						



Serial No. 09/781,842

Art Unit 1712

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 40 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 40 and 43 are substantial duplicates, each of the other.

3. The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obvious-type or non-obvious-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); In re Van Ornam, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and In re Goodman, 29 USPQ 2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 (b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78 (d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a Terminal Disclaimer. A Terminal Disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 38-44 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of copending application



Serial No. 09/781,842

Art Unit 1712

Serial No. 09/539,914. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the stated claims herein read on, or at least overlap, claims 1-8 of the '914 application.

This is a *provisional* obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

- 5. Applicants' arguments filed January 8, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. The obviousness-type double patenting rejection must be adhered to in the absence of a terminal disclaimer.
- 6. Claim 45 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 7. The references listed on the attached Form PTO-1449 (IDS filed December 18, 2002) have been considered and made of record.
- 8. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). The practice of automatically extending the shortened statutory period an additional month upon the filing of a timely first response to a

Serial No. 09/781,842

Art Unit 1712

final rejection has been discontinued by the Office. See 1021 TMOG 35.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lovering whose telephone number is (703) 308-0443. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. from 7:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Dawson, can be reached on (703) 308-2340. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

R. Lovering:cdc March 12, 2003

RICHARD D. LOVERING
PRIMARY EXAMINED

GROUP 1550 1700